

March 6, 1975

Warner makes today were the same arguments he made on General File. Generally, they are invalid arguments. I think that one of the great problems of deteriorated housing is the absentee landlord and that he does intentionally let his property deteriorate because he seeks to acquire all of the revenue out of a dwelling for as long a period he can without increasing his investment because he knows he will receive a tax penalty if he does so. The result of that is to force the decline in the value of that property and in surrounding properties. I do not feel in any way that an individual or either an owner-occupied or an absentee landlord could or would want to allow a piece of property to deteriorate to take advantage of this situation. I don't think it could work that way. The point here again is if you want to see and if you want to encourage by tax policies deterioration of older sections, in this particular case residential sections of our cities and our towns across the state, this bill applies everywhere even to homestead or to farm house properties it applies everywhere throughout the state every individual dwelling that would be eligible by definition from the Legislature. If you want to encourage the deterioration of them or if you want to stimulate the redevelopment and maintenance of those homes and not penalize people for doing that, not penalize an individual who would make an improvement to an older home in order to stay in that particular area and live in an older section of the city, that's the choice that you have with this bill. I think the wise choice is to allow the people to decide through this constitutional amendment whether they wish to encourage the revitalization on an independent basis again. This is . . . we're again confronted with the situation where we're spending millions of dollars, something like \$20 million this year, of Federal housing money in the State of Nebraska to redevelop blighted housing. Here's a bill that would encourage the private home owner to do that himself and not penalize him when he does do it, when you've got the Federal government pouring in millions of dollars to achieve the same result. I think the bill calls for your . . . a decision in your mind as to whether or not you feel that the best way to deal with these kind of problems are on an individual basis and the stimulus for the individual to act responsibly and not be penalized for government . . . for acting responsibly, or if you want to use massive amounts of Federal monies to deal with the problem after it's deteriorated to such an extent that it is hardly manageable any more. I would hope that you would accept Senator Lewis' motion and reconsider LB 98.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I see an inconsistency between this bill and the one that was just reconfirmed. On the one hand there is to be a forgiveness of paying taxes for a person who would fix his or her home. On the other hand there is a general sweeping provision that allows any governmental subdivision to declare an entire area blighted whether an individual has fixed up a home or not. The taking of that area, clearing it, and then giving it to a private developer for redevelopment in any way he or she sees fit. I no longer see where this bill is feasible in light of the other one that was passed. I think it should be one or the other, but not both.